

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY



To:  
OKABE, Masao

No. 602, Fuji  
Bldg., 2-3, Marunouchi  
3-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo  
1000005 Japan

## PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY  
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	11.10.2005
-------------------------------------	------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
10009247WO01

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No. PCT/JP2005/010452	International filing date (day/month/year) 01.06.2005	Priority date (day/month/year) 07.06.2004
--	--	--

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
Int.Cl.<sup>7</sup> H04N5/335, H03M1/54

Applicant  
CANON KABUSHIKI KAISHA

**1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:**

- ☒ Box No. I      Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II      Priority
- ☐ Box No. III      Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV      Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V      Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI      Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII      Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII      Certain observations on the international application

**2. FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

**3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.**

Date of completion of this opinion		26.09.2005		
<b>Japan Patent Office</b> 3-4-3, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8915, Japan		Authorized officer	5P	3137
		<b>TAKESHI MATSUDA</b> Telephone No. +81-3-3581-1101    Ext. 3581		

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/010452

**Box No. I**

**Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language \_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/010452

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-20	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	9, 12, 18	YES
	Claims	1-8, 10, 11, 13-17, 19, 20	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-20	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

D1:JP 5-48460 A(Matsushita Electric Industrial Co.,Ltd.)

1993.02.26, [0021], Fig 9(a) (Family:none)

D2:JP 55-8104 A(Takeda Riken Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha)

1980.01.21, page 1, column 2, lines 10 - page 2, column 2 (Family:none)

The subject matters of claim 1-8, 10, 11, 13-17, 19, 20 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of the D1 cited in the ISR and the document 2 cited in the same. D1 discloses an image pickup device having sensing elements arranged in a matrix, and "a lamp-type A/D converter" provided for each column of said sensing elements. Technical features "a lamp-type A/D converter" and "an integration-type A/D converter", disclosed in D1 and D2 respectively, have the same function and are related to similar technical fields. Therefore, the skilled person in the art would easily conceive the idea of employing the feature "an integration-type A/D converter" in D2 to substitute the feature "a lamp-type A/D converter" disclosed in D1.

The subject matters of claim 9, 12, 18 are neither disclosed in any of the documents cited in the ISR nor obvious to a person skilled in the art.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/010452

**Box No. VIII    Certain observations on the international application**

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

The term "the first terminal" used in Claim 18 renders the definition of the subject matter of said claim unclear for the following reason: the term "the first terminal" is unknown in what is shown.